

The Office Action, on page 4, admits that Morgan fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features.

The Office Action, on page 4, states that Uchiyama does disclose the above-mentioned features. Applicants respectfully disagree. Uchiyama discloses, in Fig. 25 and paragraph [0140], a facsimile server 107 that is configured to determine that a facsimile image cannot be received by a terminal 101. The facsimile image, which cannot be received by the terminal 101, is assigned with a content ID and stored on the Internet (*see* paragraph [0141], lines 1-3). The user of the terminal 101 can retrieve predetermined storage places to confirm if the data (facsimile image) is stored, and the data (facsimile image), which is not received by the terminal 101, is then outputted with an arbitrary printing apparatus (*see* paragraph [0142], lines 1-9).

Uchiyama also discloses that the terminal 101 can output data with an arbitrary outputting apparatus by transmitting the content ID and the print outputting destination ID of the data to the print requesting administrative server 105 (*see* paragraph [0139], lines 14-19).

Thus, Uchiyama's system is configured to output the data, which is not received by the terminal 101, with an arbitrary printing apparatus according to a request from the user of the terminal 101, and not from a switching/request unit, as called for in independent claim 1, and as similarly called for in independent claims 11, 12, 14 and 18.

Furthermore, Uchiyama discloses, in paragraph [0143], that when the facsimile server 107 stores data, which cannot be received by the terminal 101, the content ID is notified to the terminal 101 to minimize the time difference between transmission of the data and the outputting of the data. This description also suggests that the unreceived data is output based on the user's request, and not from a switching/request unit.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Morgan in view of Uchiyama and in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0053122 to Kinoshita; claims 3-4, 7-10 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Morgan in view of Uchiyama as applied to claims 1 and 14 and further in view of JP 2001-236288 to Yamaguchi; and claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Morgan in view of Uchiyama as applied to claim 14 and in view of Kinoshita. The rejections are respectfully traversed.


None of the remaining references or combination of references overcome the deficiencies of Morgan and Uchiyama in disclosing or suggesting a switching or requesting unit as discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Rodney H. Rothwell, Jr.
Registration No. 60,728

JAO:RHR

Date: April 28, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
